INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Dyslexia Institute

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS	OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
	Lesson matches		Criminal Background	
Tutor Qualifications	original description	Satisfactory	Checks	
			Health/safety laws &	
Recruiting Materials	Instruction is clear	Satisfactory	regulations	
	Time on task is			
Academic Program	appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
	Instructor is			
	appropriately			
Progress Reporting	knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
	Student/instructor			
	ratio: 1:1	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Dyslexia Institute's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Dyslexia Institute SITE: Thomas D. Gregg School 15 (IPS)

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): SF

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 1

DATE: February 20, 2007 **REVIEWERS:** MC/KS

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 3:45 P.M.

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of "Satisfactory" (S) or "Unsatisfactory" (U) for each component. Providers receiving a "U" in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS The tutor worked one-to-one with one student. There was very good rapport between the tutor and
			student. The tutor and student worked on letters and phonics; used keywords for letter sounds and
			recognition. The student worked on blending sounds; the tutor made sure the student always used
			full sentences. The tutor also practiced spelling words and word sounds with the student, and they
			returned to what they had been working on last time to review and also to build upon concepts. The
Lesson matches original description in			tutor used sequential processes as described in the original application. The tutor provided scaffolded instruction as appropriate. Sessions included visual (pictures & cards), kinesthetic (finger
provider application	X		spelling), and auditory (speaking & reading aloud) elements, as described in application.
			The student always understood what was expected of her; instructions were clear, as was the lesson
			purpose and techniques used. The tutor was able to recognize areas in which the student struggled
Instruction is clear	X		and address those areas. The tutor did a good job reviewing previous lessons and building upon previous lessons in the current lesson.
mstruction is cicu	74		previous ressons in the earrent resson.
			The student remained constantly on task and engaged. The tutor recognized when student needed a
			break and took breaks as appropriate. The student was very interested in the lesson and appeared to
Time on task is appropriate	X		enjoy working with the tutor.
			The instructor seemed well aware of the student's strengths and areas for improvement. The tutor
			maintained an excellent rapport with the student and provided appropriate encouragement. The tutor
			was knowledgeable of the overall program, instructional methods described in the original
			application, and appropriate instructional methods for the student. The tutor used multiple
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	X		instructional methods.
Student/instructor ratio: 1:1	X		Student/instructor ratio matches that described in original application.